



GRUB-STREET

VERSUS

Bowman.

*Tum varia illudunt pestes : Sæpe exiguis mus,
Aut oculis capti fodere cubilia talpæ;
Inventusque cavis bufo Et quæ plurima terræ.
Monstra ferunt.* Virg. Georg. I.



LATE little Writer having offered himself as a Candidate to be admitted into our Society; the Secretary produced the following Letter concerning him: and desired he might have leave to read it, before we entered upon the Debate.

Mr. BAVIUS,

I Presume you have seen a Pamphlet newly published, with this Title, *The Traditions of the CLERGY destructive of Religion; with an enquiry into the grounds and reasons of such Traditions. A SERMON preach'd at the Visitation held at Wakefield in Yorkshire, June 25, 1731. By WILLIAM BOWMAN, M. A. Vicar of DEWSBURY.* Whether this Visitation was held by the *Bishop* (*Archbishop* I should have said) or by the *Archdeacon*, the title page

B

does

does not inform us. However that be; since all ecclesiastical *Penalties*, such as Excommunication, and Deposition from the Ministry, (one of which, at least, I think this Preacher has † incurred) seem to be *legally abolished by desuetude*, as no doubt they ought to be; together with all other Penalties, which are clogs upon *free thinking*, and hinder men from spreading all sorts of *Antichristianism*, for *conscience sake*: the only *persecution* of such noble and generous Spirits which now remains, is, by way of pen and ink. And in that way I am resolved, like a furious, uncharitable *High-Churchman*, that is, a Christian, and a Church of *England Man*, as I am, to persecute this same Vicar of *Dewsbury*.—To be more serious, Mr. BAVIUS; my design of writing at present is not so much upon the account of this *extraordinary Gentleman*, who is by no means worth my notice; as to give *one instance* of the *distinguishing genius* of the *Age* in which we live; an Age teeming with *Monsters*, and bringing forth fresh ones almost every day. Were I *capable* of being *surprized* at *any thing* of this nature, after so much experience; *This*, I confess, would *surprize* me. But I have long since left off *wondering* at such *things* as these; and at *some others*, which shall be *nameless*. Yet I know not how it is, I feel a struggle within my self, between indignation and contempt

† See Canon 3d compar'd with his Sermon p. 5, 6. See also Can. 5. and Article 20. compar'd with his Sermon p. 20, and Article 33 compar'd with his Sermon p. 20, 23.

versus B O W M A N. 3

tempt, at sight of the stuff which lies before me: so wicked and pernicious, as seemingly to *require* an answer; so senseless and illiterate, as to render him almost ridiculous, who shall go about to *make* one. This I should not have been at the pains to mention; but that it is equally applicable to *the rest* of the trash and trumpery, with which our Church and Religion are daily pelted by such wretched scriblers. But to the particular point. — Let our *Monster* appear; and we will *shew* him fairly.

HERE is a Clergyman of the Church of *England*, in his clerical habit, in the pulpit, at a publick Visitation, spitting the bitterest gall and venom (to the best of his small understanding) against that Church, of which he is not only a Member, but a Minister; that Church, whose bread he eats, and whose doctrines and discipline he has, in effect, sworn to defend; and this in form, in the plainest words imaginable, *distinguishing* the Church of *England* by name, to prevent mistakes. He denies her power of excommunicating, and absolving, of making canons, &c. abuses the whole body of her Clergy (except such as he imagines like himself) and delivers them over to be scorned, hated, and worried by the Laity. — *Demetrius, and the Craftsmen in wrath, when their craft is in danger to be set at nought* — *Priestcraft* — *Superstition* — *Priests of ALL RELIGIONS inculcate this profitable delusion* — *Priestly domination* — These, and many more such like, are the flowers

4 GRUB-STREET

interpersed up and down through this beautiful Composition. The word *Reverend* is all along used with *spight* and *contempt*. He carefully *distinguishes* himself from the *Church* and *Clergy*; which, I confess, is very kind to both: Sure I am, he ought by law not only to be *distinguished*, but cut off from both. *A Church* (says he) *that CALLS HERSELF pure and reform'd, and her Ministry orthodox and apostolical. But, alas! &c. p. 5. Would THE CLERGY be but once so moderate, &c. WE would not dispute, &c. p. 24, 25. I know that as our Church has tenets, &c. so to oppose them—is IN HER CANDID JUDGMENT a kind of Erastianism. p. 8.* You see the two Parties therefore: *THIS CREATURE*, and such as he, if there be any such, on the one hand; *THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND* on the other. HE begins his Preface with the usual *Cant* of every profligate witling, who has a mighty mind to do mischief, if he knew how; who wants to be in print; to be talked of for *something* (having not sense and honesty enough to be talked of for any thing that's good) to be stared at as a *strange exotick Animal*, rather than not be *taken notice of at all*: I say, he begins with the usual *Cant*, that truly he was forced to print in *vindication* of himself, *from the ill-natured censures and gross merepresentations of some of his Reverend Auditors.* Pref. p. 3. What censures could be ill-natured upon such a Piece as this? What misrepresentations

tions *could* there be? Can either the *wit*, or *dullness*, the *mistaken zeal*, or *villany* of man, make it worse than he himself has made it, as 'tis now printed? Some of his Reverend Auditors? Was it not condemned by them *All*? Was there *one* in *Torkshire*, but himself, that could approve of it? For my part, I never was in that County in my life: but I have so good an opinion of it, as to be well assured, that it's air is breath'd by no more than *one* BOWMAN.

TRUTH (says he) *has always appeared to me in so amiable a light; and prejudice and bigotry in such dismal and deform'd colours, &c.* Ibid. This again is the everlasting *Cant* of such as he. You scarce ever knew an empty, impudent Novelist oppose the plainest, most important, and most generally received truths; but he prefaced his ungodly crudities with an insipid declamation about his *love of truth*, his *abhorrence of prejudice*, and so forth.

HE then complains of the *foul language*, and *opprobrious names* which have been given him. Pref. p. 3, 4. This is a third instance of stale *Cant*: I still use that word, Mr. BAVIUS; for 'tis mere *Cant*; and nothing else. And I desire what I remark upon it in the three instances may be apply'd to the Enemies of our Church, and of Christianity, in common, not to Him only: otherwise I should not say so much about it. No sooner can one of them scrawl out a Pamphlet, or Libel, for which he *deserves* the worst

6 GRUB-STREET

appellations that language can furnish, both for its *wickedness* and *dullness*, and accordingly *has* them given him by all the world in a manner; but presently this is *calling names*. I ask, what names can be *too bad* for him? *He* at the same time insults the whole Church, and Clergy, with the utmost scurrility and insolence; and 'tis mighty well. He may use all mankind, particularly his Ecclesiastical Governors, as he thinks fit: but his own *single worthless person* must be sacred. If he be *chastised* as he deserves (or not a quarter *so much* as he deserves) and *called* what he really *is*, and has been *proved* to be, 'tis *calling names* forsooth; extremely rude, and ill-manner'd. What names did not *Tully* call *Catiline*, tho' he was a man of higher birth and quality than *Tully* himself? Yet I never heard the *Romans* accused the latter of *ill-breeding* upon that account; because *Catiline* was a traitor to his country. And shall traitors to their Church, their Saviour, and their God, and consequently Traitors, in effect, to their King, and Country too, be treated with more ceremony? especially, when they are *in* and *of* themselves such *little insects* as these; like other *vermin*, as *despicable*, as *odious*; and *considerable* for nothing but *doing mischief*?

BUT a candid expostulation from his Reverend Brethren would (we are told) have been of much more service, than the opprobrious names of *Erafrican*, *Heretic*, and *Apostate*. *Ibid*. What would a candid expostulation, or
any

any expostulation signify to one of so hardened a forehead; who *set out*, at first, not with *private*, modest doubts, and queries, but with a *publick*, insolent, abusive defiance of the whole Church?

It is always (continues he) a presumption of a bad cause, when foul language is called in to supply the place of argument. Ibid. If there be the least glimpse, or shadow of an argument, in all his ridiculous Pamphlet (for I can by no means prevail with myself to allow it the title of a Sermon) I will own, tho' I am not obliged to it, that he deserves none of the names which have been, or shall be given him. Nothing therefore can be more pleasant than his using, in his Sermon, (as he calls it) such words as these. *To set this question in as clear a light, as the thing will admit of.* page, 9. *Thus is it, I think, manifest beyond all contradiction, &c.* p. 14. *Thus does Episcopal Ordination, &c.* SO THAT FROM WHAT HAS BEEN SAID, *we may, without any absurdity, conclude &c.* p. 17. Here indeed, and in other places, something is SAID; but nothing PROVED, or rightly CONCLUDED. He says 'tis so, and so; and that he calls *arguing*; whereas (if we may judge by this famous work) he does not know what the *medium* of an argument is, nor the difference between the *proof*, and the *thing* to be *prov'd*. If I do not PROVE this, Mr. BAVIUS, I will never pretend to *prove* any thing. All he alledges is either *false* in fact, or *gratis dictum* in reason; he wriggles about,

8 GRUB-STREET

about, plays his hands, and paddles in the mud, without stirring an inch backwards or forwards; and would be absolutely stuck, if it were not for his sinking.

THE *much larger Work* he promises will, no doubt, be a master-piece. If this be a sample of it, we know already what it will be: but the Author of *the Rights*, and the *Independent Whig* have been before-hand with him: and they, tho' not quite *so wicked* (his function being an aggravation of his guilt) are more *able*; and have handled the matter much better than he can. How they themselves have been handled, and exposed to the scorn of all rational men, as well as Christians, let all rational men judge.

AND this (by the way) is answer sufficient to what he says of those Authors and himself, as to the imputation of his *borrowing* from them. Pref. p. 6, 7. Only 'tis merry enough to read the following sentence: *This, I think, will appear to any Judge of writing, from my different method of handling the same thoughts, and the variety of language in which I have expressed them.* Very solemn and pompous indeed! *Any Judge of writing!* — *Criticism* would be admirably employed upon such a Production as this. *Method* — and *Thoughts* — Why there's no such thing as *method* in it, or *thought* either: only a far-del of rambling phrases, picked up here and there, from the writings of the renown'd Authors aforesaid; and put together he knows not how. *The variety of language!*
—Mean-

—Meaning, I suppose, such language as this; which we have in the immediately foregoing page, and in the compass of seventeen lines: *But as to its being essential to the Church, I think I have reason to deny, [Subaud. that it is so.] — And those of her that exercise, &c.* Because 'tis proper to say *Those of the Church of England*; he thinks 'tis proper to say *those of her*, when the Church of England is meant. Whatever his doctrine may be, his style is extraordinary. But these are trifles.

[Pref. p. 5. *A Reverend Brother, who was many miles off when it was deliver'd, has more than once preach'd his Audience to Sleep, in confuting Things I never advanc'd.* Not to mention the spight and insolence in the manner of expressing; what if he was many miles off, when this Sermon was preach'd? Could he not have an account of it from those who heard it? O! but your Sermon was misrepresented to Him. And why could not His be misrepresented to You, Mr. BOWMAN? And how then can you so confidently affirm, that he *confuted things you never advanc'd?* — Might not that malicious circumstance, that he *preach'd his Audience to sleep*, be likewise a misrepresentation? Or if it were true, might not the soporific quality be more in your Doctrine, than in his arguments against it?]

P. 7. *WHAT reception the following Discourse will have in the world, I neither*
C know

know, nor care. There breathed the very soul of Self-Conceit, steeled with obstinacy and impudence, and proof against all conviction. He proceeds; giving us to understand that he does it purely out of conscience; talking of his being *content to face Inquisitions, dungeons, scourges, and racks.* Why really, *as to that Article of scourging, a ROD for the fool's back* would be not improper. But what an heroical declaration is here at this time of day! How *powerful* is the Church of *England!* How *dreadful* her *Inquisition!* He knows he is very *safe*: and would not have done what he has, had he not expected to be something *more than safe* for so doing. He concludes, *Let ignorance, or ill nature, &c.* Here is more than a broad hint, that those, who differ from him, do it out of *ignorance*; that is, the learned Prelates and Clergy of the Church of *England*, living and dead, famous all the world over for their immortal writings, and particularly for their defence of our Church against opposers of *all kinds*, are *ignorant*; and this absolute *Ignoramus* the only *knowing* person. This is the true *modesty* of the *blessed times* we live in. *How knowing* he is, will appear from the sequel. Having done then with his *Preface*, I go on to what he calls his *Sermon*: for That (tho' it has been in some measure taken notice of already;) must be a little more particularly examined.

[Serm. p. 1 Mat. xv. 6. *Thus have you made the commandment of God of none effect by your*
tra-

tradition. Does he think then, that the Doctrine of the *Perpetuity of Episcopacy*, tho' it were *false*, as it is *not*, makes the *Commandment of God of none effect*; or is *any thing like* that *Tradition* which our Saviour here condemns? If he does; why did not he *prove* it? Which he has not so much as attempted. If he does not; why did he take this Text? Or what relation has it to his Subject?]

HE tells us (p. 2.) that *all the pious frauds of the Papists were confessedly calculated to aggrandize the Priesthood.* How *confessedly*? What, by the confession of the Papists themselves? *We* say so indeed, and very truly; but *they* don't: and the word *confessedly* was ever, 'till now, intended to imply a *concession* from a person owning, and granting something to his *Adversary*. I only mention this, to shew his extreme ignorance in *common language*; tho' *I confess* 'tis nothing in comparison of his greater ignorance in *all points* relating to the *Subject* he *endeavours* to handle. Or will he say, that he means his *confessedly* with reference to us Church of *England* men; as if *we* contended for the same ecclesiastical power as the *Papists* do, yet acknowledging their pious frauds, &c? If he does say so; 'tis a *scandalous calumny*, and a *sottish begging of the question*, into the bargain.

WHAT he further throws out concerning Papists, Pagans, Mahometans, and Jews (p. 2, 3.) is most impertinent. Does it follow,

that, because there are *false* claims, pretensions, and doctrines, therefore there are *no* true ones? But this is fresh *Cant*; exactly of a piece with that of our wonderfully enlightened *modern Infidels*, in their declamations against *Christianity*. Because there have been *counterfeit* miracles and inspirations, therefore there were never any *real* ones: because *some* books are *spurious*, therefore the *Bible* is so.

[P. 3. *The grand Impostor Mahomet had now slept undistinguish'd — but for the pretended Visions he saw, &c.* If this be of any manner of significancy, 'tis against *Revelation*, and *Inspiration*, the Truth of which BOWMAN seems to *acknowledge*; not against *Episcopacy*, and *Church-Authority*, which he in his Libel would *fain* oppose. It, in truth, proves *nothing at all*: 'Tis plain, however, He *mistook* his Subject, and did *not know*, what he was *talking of*.

P. 3, 4. *Was Religion indeed nothing but a politick institution — this Procedure* [Priestcraft] *had been not only tolerable, but a well concerted Scheme of future Greatness.* For a *Procedure* to be a *Scheme*, and for *Priestcraft* to be either a *Procedure*, or a *Scheme*, is a little odd: but let that pass. *Future Greatness?* What? *Greatness in the other world?* Is *Priestcraft* to reign there too? For if *this* world be meant; sure 'tis a *Scheme* of *present* Greatness to those who make it, as well as of *future* to those who come after. Are your *Priestcraft-Men* so
dis-

disinterested, that they have no regard to *themselves*, but to *posterity* only? However; suppose there were *neither Revelation, nor God in the World*; (Ibid.) why is Priestcraft not *only tolerable*, but a *well concerted Scheme*, &c? *Tolerable—to whom?* And *well concerted—for whom?* But of this *profound Reasoning* more in the next words. *And as long as the World was easy under this Priestly Domination, there was no mighty mischief done.* No? Now, I think there was a great deal; and is still, where *real Priestcraft* prevails, as among the Papists; supposing still there were no *Revelation*, and no *God*: a circumstance, by the way, which alters not *this Case* at all; tho' you lay so much stress upon it. You, Sir, with all your pretended zeal against *Priestcraft*, are much more favourable to it, than we *Church of England Men*. The *Laity* were, and are, shamefully deluded, and enslaved by it, where ever it obtains; contrary to the Spirit of Christianity, and the Church of *England*. Or if a few of the *wiser part of Mankind* had found out the *Cheat*, it had probably been buried in their own *Breasts*. Why so? I should imagine the direct contrary. But your very next word *For* seems to promise a reason. *For who that has any regard to his own Welfare ——— would endeavour to undeceive the World in a Point, in which it is every Man's Interest they should be deceived?* Every man's? I always thought the *Priests*
only

only had gained by *Priestcraft*; and that it was, and is, the interest of *every body else* to detect it. If by *Priestcraft* indeed he means *Religion*; I own there is something in what he alledges: because *Religion*, tho' it were a cheat, would contribute to the temporal interest of all Mankind. But he cannot mean *that*, consistently with his other Doctrine; which acknowledges the *Truth* of *Religion*, and *Revelation*. Let any man who reads these *two Paragraphs* of his, ask himself, whether ever he saw an example of so *muddy a head*, and such *exquisite ignorance*.]

WHEN he affirms (p. 4.) that *God's word* is *sufficient without other helps*, &c. what does he mean? If *without Ministers* to *expound* and *instruct*; 'tis both *false*, and *contradictory* to what he *himself* grants, p. 7, 8: If *without other religions*, as by what follows he seems to mean; 'tis *true* indeed, but exceeding *impertinent*: for who among us denies it? Did he ever hear, that the Church of *England* was for any Religion but that contained in the Old and New Testament? He talks much here in favour of the *Scriptures*; asserting the *sufficiency* of them, which no body among us, again, ever deny'd: But does not the Scripture command us to *obey them who have the rule over us*, because *they watch for our Souls*? How then comes he, in defiance of Scripture, for which he pretends
fo

so much reverence, to oppose the *authority* of *Church-Governours*?

P. 6. *There are too many* (speaking of the Church of *England* Clergy) *haughty and enthusiastick men, who call themselves, and those of their Order, the SPIRITUAL PRINCES OF THE EARTH.* He means the *Bishops*, who, it seems, are *haughty and enthusiastick men.* Very *modest and mannerly*; not to say *dutiful.* But this, to be sure, is not *calling names*: because 'tis only all the *Bishops of England* who are so named; and the great BOWMAN, Vicar of *Dewsbury*, who so names them. That they *call themselves* *Spiritual Princes*, I never heard: They may *by others* perhaps have been called *Spiritual Princes*, or *Princes of the Church*; and where's the mighty harm of it? The word *Prince* does not always imply a relation to the *Royal Family.*

BUT do the *Bishops of England* wrest the prerogative of God out of his sacred hands; juggle *Omnipotence* out of the world, and substitute themselves in its place; making void the commandments of God by their traditions? He says they do; and I say 'tis a malicious, stupid, impudent LYE: all the world knows it to be a *Lye.* His assertion, his bare assertion, is capable of no other answer, in sense; and ought to have no other, in expression. More might be observed here, to expose his ignorance about the word *traditions*; and to shew, that he does not understand the meaning of his text: But

I wave

16 GRUB-STREET

I wave That, and other circumstances; having something else to do with my time, than to be formal and particular upon such a rhapsody of folly and falshood as this is.

He is graciously pleased to acknowledge, *that there must be some to preach and expound the word of God, as long as there is a Church and a Religion*, p. 7. This indeed is very condescending; but not so consistent with the main tenor of his doctrine. For it seems there must be a *Ministry* (he himself owning, p. 8. that these *Preachers* must be sent) *as long as there is a Church and a Religion*: And this is said upon supposition, that a Church and Religion are *good things enough*, at least *tolerable*. But as he afterwards asks questions, *How shall they hear without a Preacher?* And, *How shall they preach except they be sent?* So here I ask, How shall there be a *Church*, and *Ministers*, and *Religion* itself, without *Church-Authority* and *Church-Government*? To destroy which is the design of this unparallel'd *Libel*.

He says, p. 8. that these *Preachers* must *reprove, rebuke, exhort with all* LONG SUFFERING AND DOCTRINE. But did he never hear of the same Apostle's Command; *Exhort, and rebuke with all* AUTHORITY? Had he not shamefully prevaricated; he would have cited this passage, as well as the other. But he avoided it; because he *did not know* but it might look like an Argument against him.

H E

HE is likewise pleased to acknowledge, that *SOME KIND of mission is absolutely necessary*. p. 8. Ay; but *WHAT kind of mission?* Episcopal mission, he is positive, is not *necessary*, nor designed to be *perpetual*; yet he owns it to be *Apostolical*. Can there be any *kind of mission*, but what is derived from the Apostles? *Episcopal*, he owns, is so derived; and he does not so much as pretend that *any other* is. *What kind of mission* then (according to him) can a man have, but Episcopal? A fine medley this of *truth, falsehood, and self-contradiction*.

P. 9. FROM this *Apostolical Institution*, our Clergy, desirous to persuade the world that they have something in them of so divine a nature, as in an especial manner distinguishes them from the rest of mankind, &c. Why have they not some such thing? He himself grants, that Episcopacy is of *Apostolical institution*: And where is the great difference between an *Apostolical institution*, and a *Divine one*? Some learned Writers indeed have rather chosen the word *Apostolical*, than *Divine*; because the latter is more subject to foolish cavils: but they acknowledge, that the thing is, in effect, the same. The common distinction of *proximè* and *remotè*, or *immediately* and *mediately*, adjusts the whole matter. See the most pious, judicious, and acute Bp. SANDERSON'S Treatise entitled *Episcopacy, as establish'd by Law in England, not prejudicial to Regal Power*: in which, tho' he chuses the word *Apostolical*,

he declares he means by it, in effect, the same as *Divine*; and gives unanswerable reasons to justify the latter way of speaking.

BUT our *Vicar* goes on. *From this Apostolical institution, &c. our Clergy draw this pleasant inference in favour of themselves; viz. that Episcopal Ordination is essential to the Church of Christ, &c.* Well; and why, I pray, is this so *pleasant* an inference? *Divine* and *Apostolical* have been considered already. And did not the Apostles, by your own confession, institute *Episcopal* ordination? And did they institute *any other*? You *your self* don't so much as *pretend* they did. Where then is the mighty *pleasantness* of this inference? But of this curious arguing more immediately. At present I refer to those many learned Authors, who have proved, to a demonstration, that Episcopacy is *necessary* to the *well-being* at least, if not to the *being* of a Church; *essential* to a Church in the *strictest sense*, to a Church *most properly* so called; and that those which *want* it, are not so *perfect* as those which *have* it. I might perhaps with truth add more; but I forbear.

AND consequently (continues he) *that there are no true Churches upon earth, but those of England and Rome.* *England* and *Rome* seem to be here coupled together, for the sake of scandal upon the former. But to let that pass: are there no Churches that have Episcopacy, but those of *England* and *Rome*? Did he never hear of the *Greek* or
East-

Eastern Churches? 'Tis plain, he never did; or knows not what they are.

BUT he proceeds. *Whether these tenets be consistent with Christian Charity, or no, that charity which believeth all things, &c. p. 10. Cant* again, dull, spiteful *Cant*; flung out upon all occasions against the Church of England, the most *charitable* Church in the world. *That charity which judgeth not, lest it be judg'd. ib.* For a man not to judge, &c. is very good sense: but those words, *Charity that judgeth not, LEST IT BE JUDGED*, I take to be *nonsense*; and I mention them for no other reason. *Charity* here must mean the *charitable person as such*: and how he can be *judg'd*, i. e. *condemn'd*, I understand not. But, Mr. BAVIUS, I beg pardon; I should never have done, were I to remark upon all these *trifles* of his *ignorance* and *stupidity*.

THAT Episcopal ordination was instituted by the Apostles, he grants; but denies *that it was instituted for a POSITIVE* (as he strangely and illiterately speaks) *and perpetual ordinance. ibid.* Now I always apprehended (and so I believe does every body in his wits) that *an institution* must of course be understood, as intended for *perpetuity* and *universality*; unless the *nature of the thing* shews the *contrary*; or in the institution itself, there be some *proviso* to the *contrary*; some *specification of time and place*, to *limit* and *determine* it. Thus it is in all Laws,

humane, and divine: as is well known to all who know any thing of these matters.

BUT now for *his Arguments*, back'd and fortify'd with a *THUS have I prov'd*, and *THUS it is manifest*, &c. Pray, observe 'em carefully. *Whatever is instituted by the Apostles*, as perpetual and necessary, must not be *obscur'd in darkness and ambiguities*: this is *inconsistent with the goodness of God—who cannot but make every thing that concerns the everlasting happiness of our souls clear, obvious, and indisputable*. p. II. CANT, once more; *stale, standing Cant*; borrow'd from the *half witted Infidels* of these times, and perpetually employ'd against the *Christian Religion*. ——— *Clear and obvious?* To whom? Are all understandings *alike*? Not but that the assertion is *ridiculously false* with respect to *all*. How do they *PROVE*, that God in his goodness must make *every thing* that concerns our Salvation so *very plain*? Here is no appearance of *proof*; 'tis said, and that's all. The contrary is much more agreeable to right reason. God is infinitely *wise*, and *just*, as well as *good*; and it was not *fit*, that he should make *all things* that concern our Salvation so *very plain* at first sight, and to all capacities; no, nor to *any* capacity; but that something should be left to our *own labour, study, and diligence*, and to the *instruction* of those whom He has appointed to be his *Ministers*. This man himself acknowledges, that there must be such Ministers

to

to *expound* the Scriptures. Why then must *every thing* that concerns Salvation be so *very plain*? But 'tis endless to take notice of all his contradictions and other absurdities; tho' contain'd in a Pamphlet, which may be deliberately read over in half an hour.

YET, we are told by him, that these points must be not only *clear* and *obvious*, but *INDISPUTABLE*. Nay then, farewell all Religion indeed. For nothing can be *indisputable* in *such times as these*; when there are so many *captious*, *pragmatical* Dunces, who without the *least knowledge* in the *laws* of *disputing*, or in *any thing else*, will take upon them to *dispute* the *sun* out of the *firmament*, and *themselves* (if they ever had any) out of *common sense*.

How great an honour soever I may have for the *modern Dissenters* in *England*, (as doubtless I ought to honour them very greatly) for the *reform'd Churches* abroad, and above all, for the *renown'd*, *illustrious Church* (or *Kirk*) of *SCOTLAND*; I humbly beg leave to say, that their rejecting Episcopacy is not an *incontestable evidence* (as our Author says it is) that the *perpetuity* and *universality* of Episcopacy are not *clear* and *obvious*. There are many, some even here in *England*, who reject *Christianity* it self. Now, that the truth of Christianity is *clear* and *obvious*, will this *Disputer* of *DEWSBURY* *acknowledge*? or will he *not*? If the first; then, it seems, a thing's being

22 GRUB-STREET.

being rejected by Many is no proof, that it's truth is not clear and obvious; If the last; then God is not obliged by his goodness to make every thing clear and obvious, that concerns salvation: For that the Christian religion does somewhat concern it, I hope our Vicar will not deny; because he *as yet* professes himself to be a Christian.

'Tis indeed a reasonable inference (says he, p. 12.) *that because the Apostles instituted this ordinance, and the primitive Church rigorously observ'd it, and consequently that AT THAT time it was the best, &c. therefore CIRCUMSTANCES REMAINING THE SAME, that is, as long as it continues the best apparent Institution, it ought to be inviolably and religiously maintain'd.* Well; and *when did the circumstances alter?* Why is it not still the best apparent Institution? Afterwards; *But to say, that because, &c. therefore that ordinance is to be observ'd, even when circumstances are such, that 'tis the worst and most detrimental ordinance the Church can have, ibid. &c.* Very well again: *But when was it, or where is it the worst, and most detrimental, &c?* Not a word of these matters, upon which *all turns*: and this is *proof and argument.*

[P. 12. WHEN he speaks of the HICKES's and LESLEY's of the age; he plainly intends to give us a contemptuous flirt upon the memory of those Great Men. Sir, I am not of their opinion in *all things*; those particularly,

particularly, for the sake of which you *invidiously* mention them: yet I must tell you, that they were men to whom the *Reformation* is infinitely obliged for their admirable Treatises against Popery; as is *Christianity*, for their many other excellent works; and that when they were of your age (whatever that may be) they had more *parts* and *learning* in the most retired corner of their brains, than you will ever have in all yours, if you live to the age of *Methuselah*.]

He goes on, *And as certainly as the tempers of all men and times are not the same; so certainly could not the Apostles design, that an institution ADAPTED TO PARTICULAR times and tempers, &c.* *ibid.* But how does he *prove* that it was *so adapted*? Why, he *says* it; and *thus has he prov'd it.* Or did he *mean* an argument in those words. *As certainly as the tempers — are not the same?* If so, it stands thus; and he is obliged to me for making it *look* like an argument. Because all tempers and times are not the same; therefore the Apostles could not design Episcopacy to be universal, and perpetual, but only adapted, as aforesaid. This argument is worse than none at all; and will prove as strongly against the perpetuity of any *Act of Parliament* in *England*, generally and indeterminately worded as against the perpetuity of Episcopacy. Take, for example, the *Act of Uniformity*; because it has a relation to our present subject. It is enacted, that the Liturgy shall

be

be us'd, &c. not a word of *for ever*. Yet was not the Act intended to be *perpetual*; notwithstanding the *variety* of *times* and *tempers*?

[IN the days of the Apostles themselves, by whom he owns Episcopacy was instituted, there were *various forms of Civil Government* in the World, &c. and consequently a *variety of tempers*; yet Episcopacy was instituted for them *all*, without the *least notice* taken of that *variety*.]

WHAT he talks, p. 13, 14, 20, 21, 22, 23, 10, 19. about the *powers* of the *Church*, as compar'd with the *State*, here in *England*; as also about *excommunication* and *absolution*, p. 23, 24, &c. could issue from nothing but the *profoundest ignorance* of the *Constitution* of *England*; of our *Laws* in the *State*; of our *Canons* and *Articles* in the *Church*. By vertue of which ignorance, he *gives* to the *State* powers which she never *claim'd*; and *charges* upon the *Church* usurpations and encroachments which she absolutely *disclaims*: such as *entire independence*, *unconditional absolution*, and so forth. Every body, that is at all vers'd in these matters, knows her doctrine about the *King's supremacy* in causes Ecclesiastical, and how it has been *explain'd* and *vindicated* by her learned Divines; how far, and in what respects (according to *her* and *them*) the *Church* is, and is not *independent*; what is the difference between powers *purely spiritual*, *political*, and *mix'd*: How all these points have been largely discuss'd;

cuss'd; on the one hand, against *Papists*, who accuse our Church of having *betray'd*, and *given up* her *spiritual rights* and *authority*; on the other hand, against TINDAL, and his creatures (of whom this BOWMAN is one) who would fain persuade mankind, that she *has*, and *ought to have*, *no rights*, or *authority* at all. See, among innumerable others, Bishop SANDERSON'S Treatise above-mention'd; HEYLIN'S *Reformation justify'd*; BRAMHALL and HAMMOND against Popery, &c.

[P. 13. FROM the supposed perpetuity of this institution [Episcopal Ordination] a CONSEQUENCE will naturally result, which will overturn the foundation of all Civil Government. Dreadful indeed! But how so, I beseech you? Where's this *consequence*? Why thus, As it IMPLIES an entire independence of the State. How so again? How does it so imply? Where's the PROOF? For a divine institution is not cognizable by the Civil Power. Yes, but it is; so far cognizable, as to be directed and determined by it in its outward publick exercise, with regard to time, and place, and other circumstances; while the Church and State are in accord with each other, and the former protected by the latter. It follows that the Government can exact no legal security for the behaviour of the Clergy, but what they themselves are pleased to give — with a deal of stuff to the same purpose, in more aggravating and malicious expressions, making the Clergy, up-

on principle, and by the very constitution of the Church, *rebels and traitors*. *How*, once more, does this *follow*? And *how* do the Clergy pretend to be no farther subject to the Civil Power than they think fit? This is expressly *contrary* to the doctrine of the Church of *England* (the most *LOYAL* Church in the world) and of her learned Defenders. If *something* of what you say (for it is not *true* of *all*) be maintained by a *very few* of those, who do not conform to the *present Establishment*; what is that to *us* who do? or to the Church of *England*? Whose Canons, Articles, and Liturgy are in every body's hands; and consequently her sense upon these heads is sufficiently known.

P. 14. His observation upon *consequences*, whether true or false, is not to be minded; because 'tis nothing to his *point*; if he may be said to have any. *But when the consequences* (says he) *are such, that they absolutely destroy other, even self-evident doctrines, &c.* But, prithee, what *ARE those consequences*, or those *self-evident doctrines*? Thou hast given us no account of them yet. All thy *imaginary argumentations* proceed either upon a *petitio principii*, or an *ignoratio elenchi*, as the Logicians speak: Not that I suspect thee of so much *Logick*, as to know what I mean: but others will; and to them I write. This, I know, you and *your fellows* will call *pedantry*: but if you *understood* that *pedantry*, you would talk better *sense*, and talk more to the *purpose*.

P. 15. THE OTHER reason, why Episcopal Ordination is supposed an essential, &c. is, that it conveys—some necessary requisite for the work of the Ministry. It conveys one very great requisite, and that is a *commission*: but I know of no other it is pretended to convey. So that he might have spared his division into his two heads, p. 10, 11. The *commission* belongs to the first; and this OTHER reason, meaning something else besides the commission, (viz. *extraordinary helps*, &c.) is alledg'd by no body among us of the Church of England.]

P. 15. He knows no requisite for the work of the Ministry, but piety and learning. — And does ignorance or immorality flee at the Bishop's approach? No, I'll be sworn: He himself is a proof of the contrary. For he can be an argument, tho' he can't make one. He is copious in telling us, that Ordination does not confer *extraordinary helps* and *assurances*. Who ever said it did? He himself distinguishes between the *ordinary* and *extraordinary* gifts. Ordination confers a *commission*: which is enough to justify those words, *Receive the Holy Ghost* [over which, says the Scripture, *the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers,*] but no body pretends that it confers *inspiration*.

THUS for the Ordainer: then for the Ordained; he asks, p. 16. *Do any of us feel any other motions of the spirit, than a serious and devout thoughtfulness,*

&c? Yes; a little more: A particular *inclination* to, and *desire* of, that holy employment; a *dedicating* and *devoting* ourselves *chiefly* to those studies. This is, or ought to be, the temper of every man's soul, who answers that question, *Do you think, that you are mov'd by the Holy Ghost?* A motion still *ordinary*, not *extraordinary*; at least as far as we know.

[P. 16, 17. *NOR* do I apprehend, that the promise -- *Lo I am with you always even unto the end of the world*, implies any extraordinary assistances, &c. but only, that wherever two or three are gathered together in our Saviour's name, there is he in the midst of them. Now I apprehend it to imply a little more; even this, that our Saviour will have a Church upon earth to the world's end.

P. 17. *The sayings of persons* [the primitive FATHERS] *in favour of an Oeconomy they lived under.* The *Mosaic Oeconomy*, and the *Christian Oeconomy*, are phrases well known: But the *Episcopal Oeconomy* is new. To talk (as he does here) of *THEIR temptations to honour, and grandeur*, is prodigious. Their ambition to be made Bishops must needs have been great; when death and tortures were the almost certain consequences of their being so. Besides; was there ever so vile a reflection upon the character of those *holy, pious, and humble* men; who entirely renounced the world, with all its wealth and glory; and were *Martyrs*, as well as *Bishops*. What usage may not the *present* Bishops and Clergy expect from

from this man; when POLYCARP, IGNATIUS, and CYPRIAN cannot escape him.]

THE answer he gives, p. 18. to his two quotations from the Fathers proceeds upon his old *precarious assertion*, that Episcopacy was at *that time*, &c. but not for *perpetuity*. So I only take notice, that in one of them, a Greek one, he *quotes* a sentence which he could not *construe*: tho' the *Latin Translation* might have help'd him, could he have construed even *that*. Τὸν ἀντικείμενον εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν does not signify *convenient for the Church*, but *belonging to the Church*.—

HE says p. 22. that a *sanction of rewards and punishments is essential to every law*. 1st, The *sanction* is not properly a part of the law: It *enforces* it, but does not *constitute* it; and there may be a law without *any* sanction. I appeal to all learned Divines, Civilians, &c. 2dly, Not one *human law* in a hundred has *any* sanction of *rewards*: so that (according to this doctrine) almost all *human laws* are *no laws*. His affirming (ibid.) that *all laws whatsoever are ONLY about spiritual and everlasting good*, I know not how to answer, but by *quoting* it. Much the same may be answer'd to his affirming, that *it appears from the procedure of all our Ecclesiastical Courts, that the Clergy have no authority, to admit and exclude — on Earth in a judicial way, but what they derive from the Civil Power*. The reason, I suppose, is, because those Courts are held by the authority of the *Bishops*; and because in their *acts* and *processes* the *King's seal* is never

never used, nor his *name* so much as mentioned. See *Sanderſon* as before.

[P. 22. *Excluſion from the Communion, or a penance, — is as much a temporal puniſhment, as imprisonment, or death.* Not quite ſo much, certainly: *Excluſion from the communion and Penance*, were ever reckoned *puniſhments* purely *ſpiritual*, tho' they may be attended with *temporal* ill *conſequences*: However, I hope they are *partly* ſpiritual; whereas *imprisonment*, and *death*, I take to be *puniſhments wholly* temporal.

P. 26. *'Tis this affectation of Power and Grandeur has raised us ſo many Enemies in the World.* Alas! nineteen in twenty of the *Engliſh* Clergy employ their Thoughts not how to get *Power* and *Grandeur*, but how to get *Bread*; and are ſcarce able to get even *that*. And to charge the whole Body of them, indifferently, with pride, and ambition, is a moſt *malicious calumny*; to ſay they are guilty of it is a *groſs and notorious falſhood*: And what other *anſwer* CAN be given to theſe assertions? Our Enemies *affirm* it; We *deny* it: and in the name of God and man let the world judge. That we have ſo many enemies is not *our* fault; but the fault of thoſe enemies *themſelves*. 'Tis owing not to *our bad behaviour*, but to their *own bad hearts*: and a more virulent Enemy we have not, than this very man, who is a Clergyman himſelf. For when I ſay the *Clergy*; I do not mean *all* of them, but the

the *main Body*. Many others, as well as he, have upon several accounts given *scandal* enough, and great Advantage to our common adversaries; God forgive them for so doing: But what is that to the Clergy in general? And why must the innocent be involved with the guilty?

Ibid. And gave occasion to a late attempt upon us, at the thoughts of which we may yet tremble. We have cause enough to tremble, God knows, for that, and many other reasons. But to say, the Clergy's *affectation of power and grandeur*, gave occasion to that attempt, is another *malicious and notorious falsehood*. The world well knows the true state of *that matter*, and to the world I appeal.—*Ibid.* and p. 27. *Would we change this haughty Note in Time, &c.* What haughty note? I tell thee again, nineteen in twenty of the Clergy are in a starving condition; if I had said thirty nine in forty, I had said true: They *have not*, and *never had*, any thing like a *competent maintenance*. The Body of them, taken all together, is the poorest Body of men in the world: The parochial livings, one with another, don't amount to *50l. per ann.* a piece: Nor is there any Clergy in *Christendom*, whether Popish or Protestant, so ill provided for. As for power, the Church of *England* has, in a manner, *none* left: nor does she *claim* any in her canons, and articles, that in the least encroaches upon the liberties or properties of the laity. The *Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland*, in the mean time, flourishes in
full

full power, and grandeur; is as much *establish'd by law*, as the Church of *England*; and is to the last degree *countenanc'd*, and *encourag'd*: Her *General Assembly* meets every, year, as regularly as the *Parliament*; and her *spiritual Grandees* are dignify'd with the Title of *Right reverend*. *Episcopacy* is not so much as *tolerated* there, tho' *Presbytery* is somewhat *more* than *tolerated* here: And every body knows she *has* carried the Power of the *Clergy* over the *Laity*, almost as high as the *Pope* ever did *His*. Yet against *Her* there is no *Complaint*: She is complemented and caressed upon all occasions; and so are the *Presbyterian*, and *ther* Churches *abroad*; and our own *Protestant Dissenters* at home. Only the *poor* Episcopal Church of *England*, who has done *more* against *Popery* and *REAL Priestcraft*, than *all the rest of the Protestant* World put together, must at this time of day be railed on for grasping at *too much Power*; when she is, with the utmost *licentiousness*, despised, vilify'd, trampled into the dirt, by *any body* that has a mind to abuse her.—By the way, Mr. BOWMAN, were you a *Presbyter* of the *Scotch Kirk*, and should have treated *her*, as you have treated the Church of *England*; I appeal, once more, to all Mankind, whether you would have flourish'd *there*, as you are like to do *here*; or rather, whether not only your *Preferment*, but even *your Person*, would not have been in great jeopardy. No Church under heaven, unless in a state of *down-right Persecution*

cution, was ever thus insulted with *Impunity*; except the Church of *England*. That in *Scotland* (of all Churches) would be the last which would endure such Usage.

Ibid. *We have still friends sufficient left us.* — Not such *Friends* as you, I hope, and those, whose *spittle* you have been *licking up*. — *To stem the fury of designing men, &c.* Can any be more *furiosus* against us, than those, from whom you *stole* your *Invective*? Are *T—dal* and *G—don* such *Friends* to the Church? *Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis* — Sure He intended This as a *scorn*, and a *sneer* upon us: As, one would think, He did his ranking *himself* (by the Word *us*) in this last part of his *Libel*, with the Clergy of *England*; from whom he before carefully *distinguished* himself, and whom he has all along been *abusing*. But let the Enemies of our Church, (Mr. BOWMAN, with his gown upon his back, in the center of them) despise and flout her as they please. Low as she is, she is not yet altogether contemptible; and may be supposed to use those words, which the Church of God used above 2000 years ago: *Rejoice not against me, O mine enemy; when I fall, I shall arise; when I sit in darkness, the Lord shall be a light unto me.*]

I am sensible, Mr. BAVIUS, that I have been too tedious: but tho' the *Man* be of no consequence, the *Subject* is of the greatest; and so I hope you will excuse me,

Who am your humble servant,

Aug 1. 1701.

A. B.



APPENDIX.

Mr. BOWMAN's Sermon.

TRUTH shines always the brighter for being opposed. *Pref. p. 4.*

A hearty love of Truth, was the motive that induced me to speak out. p. 5. Truth and the cause of pure Religion, with me, supersedes all other considerations. p. 7. If I have erred, 'tis with a good conscience, and a readiness to retract upon sufficient conviction. p. 5.

Let ignorance then, or ill-nature rage as horribly as it will, let censures and persecutions pursue me even to death, yet while I live, there will be something within will always speak peace in the midst of a stubborn and perverse world. p. 8.

Priestcraft has generally been reputed the Parent of Superstition; p. 1.

The Paganism of old Rome had never kept its ground, nor its Priests been had in so much honour and esteem, but for their well projected deceit of

Augurs

Rights of the Christian Church, and Independent Whig.

TRUTH, the more 'tis try'd, the clearer and brighter it appears. R.

p. 414.

As the part I take in this controversy demonstrates I could have no design but the promoting of Truth, so if any shall convince me of a mistake, I shall be proud of giving an uncommon mark of love to Truth, in publicly owning and retracting my error. R. *Pref. p. 39.*

But should he [the Author] be ever so much expos'd to the malice of such men, who almost as seldom want the power as they do the will to crush all that oppose their interest; yet nothing can deprive him of the inward satisfaction he finds in endeavouring to promote the spiritual, as well as temporal welfare of mankind. R. p. 416.

Superstition was an inseparable Creature of their [Priests] Power. and the perpetual issue of it. *I. W. p. 51.* Priestcraft and Bigottry begot each other p. 184.

The old Romans had different Orders of Priests, ... the *Luperci*, the *Augurs*, the *Haruspices*, ... the *Duumviri*, ... the keepers of the *Sybilline Books*,

Augurs and *Haruspices*, of the *Sibylls* and *Duumviri*: Their *Dies fasti* and *nefasti*, their *Epule* and their *Feriae* were of infinite use in the solemn Pageantry. p. 2.

Who that has any regard to his own Welfare, to his life, or Possessions, would endeavour to undeceive the world, &c. p. 3. 4.

'Tis inconsistent with the goodness of God, to hide and obscure such Ordinances in darkness and ambiguities, which are of such vast importance to the eternal State of all Mankind. As long as our God is a good and gracious God, full of mercy and compassion, he cannot but make every thing that concerns the everlasting happiness of our Souls clear, obvious, and indisputable. p. 11.

That this concerning Episcopal Ordination is not so ... the present state of the Church of Scotland, of the reformed Churches abroad, and of the modern Dissenters in England, is an incontestable evidence. *Ibid.*

To say, that because the Apostles instituted an Ordinance, which was the best for the Church at the time of its Institution, therefore that Ordinance is to be observed even when Circumstances are such, that 'tis the worst, &c. And as certainly as the tempers of all men and times are not the same, so certainly could not the Apostles design, that an Institution

Books, &c. p. 455.

[They] had their *Dies fastos* & *nefastos*, their *Sacrificia*, their *Epulas*, their *Ferias*, in honour of their Gods and Demi-Gods, p. 456.

Who is there so regardless of his own safety, as by opposing their self-interested doctrines to create to himself such a number of relentless enemies, &c. R. p. 281.

The Creator and Preserver of mankind, cannot take delight in puzzling his Creatures with darkness and ambiguities, and in points too where their Souls are in danger. *I. W.* p. 63.

It was most agreeable to the infinite goodness and tender mercies of God, to make every thing which he requires of us, weak men, obvious, and clear. p. 61.

Those who are Successors to the Apostles in England, disown their Brother Successors beyond the *Tweed*, and about the *Lake*; and they their Brother Successors at *Rome*; &c. p. 83.

The reasons for the mutability of Ecclesiastical Polity, and the necessity of all Communitys having a right to vary and alter it as they see occasion, are as many, as the Circumstances, conditions, inclinations, Tempers, and prejudices of mankind are various. R. p. 147. We find all wise Legislators, have had special regard to the Tempers, inclinations,

tion adapted to particular Tempers and Times, should to all Tempers and at all Times ever remain the same, p. 12.

I know no other requisite for the work of the Ministry, than Piety and Learning. But does Episcopal Ordination confer either of these upon us? p. 15.

Nor do I apprehend, that that Promise of our Lord to his Apostles, *Lo I am with you always even unto the end of the world*, implies any extraordinary assistances to be given to the Ministers of the Gospel, or any particular Call to the Ministry; but only, that wherever *two or three are gathered together in our Saviour's name, there is he in the midst of them*. p. 16, 17.

Does Piety or Learning follow the imposition of Hands? Does either ignorance or immorality flee at the Bishop's approach. p. 15.

The Apostles, as men commissioned by the Holy Spirit, by an immediate communication of the same Spirit, ordained others to succeed them in the Ministry, which could not be without those extraordinary Helps and Assistances, which were

nations, and prejudices, as well as to the Circumstances under which their Subjects lay, and from time to time made such alterations relating to the Polity of Church and State, as the posture of Affairs requir'd. p. 148.

I take Honesty and Knowledge to be the essential talents requir'd for the work of the Ministry. *I W.* p. 107. Holy Orders convey nothing; neither Righteousness, nor Learning, nor Wisdom. p. 108.

The Question will be, Whether Christ's saying, *I am with you to the end of the world*, signifies any more than *walking with them, never leaving or forsaking them*; Phrases which import God's peculiar care and watchful providence over them. Does Christ, when he says, *He will be in the midst of two or three gather'd together in his name*, give 'em the Government of the Church, with power to appoint their Successors? *R.* p. 164.

If that Hand puts any thing into that Head, I would ask what it is, and how does it appear? What alteration for the better is to be found in the Person, or Endowments, or Spirit of the Party ordained? *I W.* p. 108.

The Apostles were inspired, had the gift of working miracles, could bestow the Holy Ghost, and had the discernment of Spirits; and were consequently proper Judges of mens fitness for the Ministry, and could confer that fitness. Some

were convey'd to them by the imposition of Hands, p. 15, 16.

What have we to do with extraordinary Helps and Assistances? Can we expect the all-wise God to confer an extraordinary Grace for an ordinary, tho' important Work? p. 16.

Do any of us feel any other Motions of the Spirit, than a serious, and devout Thoughtfulness, for the Work we have undertaken? *Ibid.*

Would short-sighted Men claim this Power, which only appertains to infallibility? Would he set himself in the Apostle's stead, nay rather would he not set himself above, not only the Apostles, but even that God himself? Would he wrest the scepter out of the Almighty's Hand, extort his prerogative from him, and damn or save, whom he has not damn'd or sav'd? p. 24.

Could the hapless flocks be once made to swallow this horrid delusion, there is nothing wanting to establish the tyrannical Domination of Rome; our Revenues would soon pour in Millions upon us, &c. p. 24.

Shall not every honest conscientious Christian obtain a full pardon and forgiveness of his sins, without the Priest's Absolution? Or shall not the wicked, without the thunder of Excommunication, receive the due reward of all his sins? p. 25.

He

Some modern Priests, who have no extraordinary Work to do, assert, notwithstanding, that they have an extraordinary Call from the Spirit; which would also infer his extraordinary Assistance. p. 111.

If by the Call of the Holy Ghost be meant no more than a serious and devout Bent of mind to administer in the Publick Worship of God, &c. p. 112, 113.

If there be then a judicial Power, they can save or damn as they think fit; ... and consequently it would be no great matter how people liv'd, cou'd they at last obtain Absolution from these Judges. R. p. 68. If men scruple not thus to invade the sacred and incommunicable Power of God, 'tis not to be wonder'd &c. p. 69.

Foreign Ecclesiasticks will be the first in favour, and the highest in place: they will carry off your Honours and Preferments. I. W. p. 12.

We need fear no Punishment hereafter on account of any Actions of the Priest; and consequently his Excommunicating, Cursing, Damning, Anathematizing, &c. cannot render a man's condition, as to the next world, worse than his own Actions, by which he

he must stand or fall, will make
it. R. p. 67.

They may serve indeed to
create a superstitious Awe in
the weak unthinking part of
Mankind. p. 26.

These things tending to
create a superstitious Venera-
tion for the Priests, which he
labour'd &c. R. Pref p. 51.



VERSES, *Occasioned by Mr. BOW-
MAN'S Sermon.*

I.

An Epigram in the Grub-street Journal, No. 82.

IN durance vile when pious WOOLSTON lies,
And Death waits near to close learn'd TINDAL's
eyes;

The Priest's hard fortune, and the Layman's fate,
Seem to presage Religion's sinking state.

But thou, O BOWMAN, wilt the loss supply
Of Both; and whilst thou liv'st, she cannot dye.
Oh! may'st thou not, like Those, remain so long
Unpay'd, unhonour'd, 'midst the vulgar throng:
To thy due station may'st thou rise much quicker;
And cease to lye OF DEWSBURY THE VICAR.

II.

*A Fable, at the end of the first Letter in answer to
Mr. BOWMAN'S Sermon. in No. 85.*

A Peacock once there was, (but when, or where,
My Author tells me not, nor do I care)
Which screaming loud, with inharmonious sound
Often disturb'd the neighbourhood around;
And still, at time of pray'rs, as best of all,
Perch'd on the Church, or Parsonage-house,
wou'd squawl.

For harshlest note preferr'd, as some suppose,
The noisy Peacock Nuptial JUNO chose.

But

Mr. BOWMAN'S *Sermon.* 39

BUT VENUS Bird, not hers, was our loud Prater;
A Female-lover, but a marriage-hater.

In youth his Queen he serv'd: now age had shed
The glorious honours of his tail, and head.

With these, tho' faded, a pert Peacock younger
Adorns his crest, and forms his train the longer.

Then cocking struts the self-conceited Prig,
Saucy, and quaint, like *Independent Whig*.

But, as his plumes were loosely stuck together,
Still as he stalk'd along, he dropp'd a feather.

A bold, young Daw, these second, third-hand
plumes

Picks up; and both his air and voice assumes.

Then mixing with his Tribe, the sawcy Jack
Inveighs against them all, because they're black.

Him loud haranguing, in his full career,

A Brother interrupted with a sneer.

Hadst thou, in borrow'd finery array'd,

'Mongst birds of other kind thy parts display'd;

Thus oddly dight, thou might'st have made them
wonder,

Who could not know thy head and tail asunder.

Thy learned speech, without or head or tail,

They might have lik'd, well pleas'd to hear thee
rail.

For us, with all this insolence defy'd,

Who know thy malice, ignorance, and pride;

With scorn thy stol'n, old fripery we view:

To us thy *Impudence* alone is new.

III.

The Conclusion of the Second Letter, &c. in No. 87.

Tho' far be it from me (as I am exceeding
zealous for good breeding) to call Mr. BOWMAN
any names, yet I cannot forbear subjoining a few
verses, which I remember to have heard several
years since; and that upon a Pamphlet, the sub-
ject

40 VERSES, *Occasioned by, &c.*

ject of which was very nearly akin to *this*. Others had gone about to prove, that the *Church* has no power *at all*; and the Writer of this Pamphlet, resolving to go beyond them, would shew, that the *State* likewise has none in *matters of Religion*. The lines are these,

No right, or pow'r on earth, thou say'st, is giv'n,
To punish vice, and guard the laws of heav'n.
This villain doctrine, and the sacred page,
Wrested by thee, provoke our pious rage.
Wretch! What, we cry, could move thee to declare
Against *mankind* and God, this *monstrous war*?
But when we view thy ign'rant impudence,
Thy awkward, dull, unletter'd want of sense;
Thy Idiot reasonings, and thy blund'ring vein;
Our anger ceases, all is calm again:
With pity we regard the worthless tool;
And spare the ROGUE, because we scorn the FOOL.

IV.

An Epigram in No. 89.

High Church rage on, and threat the last Excision:
Content I am to face an Inquisition;
To starve in Dungeon, destitute, afflicted,
And tho' tormented, still to Truth addicted;
To wander round the World, not worth a groat,
Disguis'd in skins of sheep, and skins of goat.
Boldly I'll still assert the Truths I've spoken,
Tho' flay'd with scourges, or on racks I'm broken.
Thus moderate, furious, Low-Church Vicar
cry'd:

And High-Church Curate, smiling, soft reply'd:
Does this proceed from zeal, or ostentation?
Hast thou not got a private Dispensation?

F I N I S.